FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION ONLY.

A SKETCH

OF THE

RISE AND PROGRESS

OF THE

RECIPROCITY TREATY:

WITH AN EXPLANATION OF THE

SERVICES RENDERED IN CONNECTION THEREWITH

BY

THOS. C. KEEFER, C.E.

TORONTO:
PRINTED BY LOVELL AND GIBSON, YONGE STREET.
1863.

1863
(12)

RISE AND PROGRESS

OF THE

RECIPROCITY TREATY.

During the Session of Parliament, held in Toronto in 1857, a Committee of the House reported in favor of paying the sum of £16,000, in addition to former contributions by Canada, toward the expenses incurred in connection with the Reciprocity Treaty. Three-fourths of this sum were then paid without relieving some gentlemen in, or connected with Canada, for moneys advanced, or liabilities incurred for the same object; and also leaving unpaid the greater part of my account for work done on behalf of Reciprocity. As the subject is again before the country, in the Estimates, I desire to explain this account for the satisfaction of the Government and Parliament, as well as I am enabled so to do after the lapse of so many years.

There has been doubtless much honest incredulity with respect to the (to us) large sums alleged to have been expended apparently in connection with the making of a few reports to Congress: or to the fact that a subordinate agent of the United States Government should have assumed such heavy personal liabilities, unauthorized by either of the contracting powers. With respect to the first, it must be remembered, that as colonists we know comparatively little about treaties,—secret service appropriations,—or the expenses attendant upon procuring legislation in countries where the Government does not control the Legislative bodies: and as to the second, diplomacy so often partakes of the character of systematized deception, that an inexperienced agent

may easily mistake encouragement for authorization. In justice to one who is not the first that has experienced public ingratitude, I embrace the opportunity, while explaining my own services, to give a sketch of the rise and progress of the movement which terminated, I think I may say unexpectedly to most persons, in the Reciprocity Treaty.

The repeal of the British corn laws and timber duties, left Canada without a market; for England had not taken the precaution when about, by this repeal, to transfer from Montreal to New York that trade which she had so recently been endeavoring to attract from New York to Montreal—to secure for us the markets of the United States, which would have gladly been granted as a consideration for her own.

On the 12th of May, 1846, our legislature addressed the Queen, praying that in the event of United States grain and breadstuffs being admitted free into Great Britain, a like privilege for the export of these articles from Canada into the United States, should be obtained: but in her newborn zeal for free trade, the mother country was too consistent to stipulate for any Reciprocity.

To facilitate the transfer to New York, and destroy the trade of the St. Lawrence, Congress, in 1846, passed a drawback-law, permitting Canadian bonded export and import through United States territory. The profits of this trade to the merchants, carriers, and canals of New York, induced those powerful interests to look favorably upon the more extended system of Reciprocity—while their abstract politicians, viewing Canada as abandoned by England, encouraged the movement as tending toward annexation. The late Hon. W. H. Merritt, on the other hand, regarding Reciprocity as almost the only antidote to the effect of the new commercial system upon Canada, and the only refuge from annexation, took the lead by introducing his celebrated Reciprocity resolutions in the Provincial Parliament, on 1st July, 1847. Mr. Hincks, in the *Pilot* denounced this movement as "preposterous"—a "crotchet" of Mr M's and declared that he had "no faith whatever in the principle of Reciprocity." Following up the question with his usual

energy, Mr. Merritt procured a delegation to Washington, and the next year Mr. Grinnell introduced a Bill to accept this proffered Reciprocity, which passed the House of Representatives without opposition. New England and the Lower Colonies, however, viewed this as a Canadian and New York measure only, which did not provide for *their* interchange: it did not, therefore, enlist the entire support of the British Minister, while the American government was positively hostile to the scheme.

The United States Consul at St. Johns, N. B., at this time, was Mr. I. D. Andrews, a native of Eastport, Maine, who had been engaged in early youth in frontier trade, which consisted more or less of smuggling. When a boy, and required by his employer to work all night at this contraband traffic, he was struck with the absurdity of two peoples, with the same language and customs, and separated only by an imaginary line, being obliged to conduct their exchanges in this manner, and early became an advocate for free trade with the Colonies. As Consul he had, in 1845 and 1846, been in correspondence with Mr. Buchanan, Secretary of State, anent the colonial trade, with particular reference to the coming changes in the policy of Great Britain—suggesting that the United States should take advantage of the same to strengthen their relations with the colonies. After Grinnell's bill passed the House, Andrews was ordered to Washington to confer with the Secretary—then engrossed with the Mexican war—about it. He opposed the measure as too narrow, urging that it should be a general one to secure the right to the fisheries, and the free navigation of the St. Lawrence and the St. John; and was requested to explain his views to Webster, Calhoun and other Senators. In consequence of this action the Bill was arrested in the Senate.

In 1849, Canada passed her Reciprocity Act and sent Mr. Merritt to Washington;—but the Bill was again lost in the Senate, and, because it was defeated there, the President refused to take the measure up under the treaty making power.

In July, 1849, Andrews was appointed by Clayton, then Secretary of State, special agent to visit Canada, and the

Lower Colonies "to collect statistical information relating to the history condition, and future prospects of these colonies, &c." I was not at this time in the service of the Government. In 1846 and 1847, under the idea that what is right is always expedient, I opposed some local jobs to the success of which it was necessary I should—as the engineer in charge—be made a party. The Government at one time were reduced to a majority of one, which majority, representing the well understood wishes of the people, required me to carry out a measure, for his benefit, which was opposed to the interests not only of the public, but of his constituents. The Government officially instructed me to do my duty,—but I was privately advised that they expected it to lie on the side of their majority. I expressed my readiness to obey any order, but stated that if the responsibility was put upon me, I must act according to my view of the case,—and did so. The result was that the work was suspended. The new elections brought a new Government—a larger majority, and larger jobs in my district. I had been much commended by the governing party, *when they were in opposition*, for my course under their predecessors; and to avoid any similar difficulty in future, they took the precaution to remove me, with assurances of distinguished consideration, *before* the matter of *their* jobs was entered upon. On this occasion *two* Members of Parliament, instead of one, wished me out of the way—and in obedience to the well understood wishes of the people, *as expressed through their representatives*, my seven years connection with the public service was, happily for me, closed in 1848.

Mr. Andrews, on his arrival in Canada, addressed himself to the late Hon. W. H. Merritt, who had joined the Government in 1849, and by him was referred to me, as a person who might aid him. I was then engaged upon questions of Commerce, Tolls and Transportation, with a view to compete for the Elgin prize for an essay on the Canals of Canada:—and was at the same time writing the "Philosophy of Railways," at the request of the President of the Montreal and Lachine Road. From September, 1849, until April, 1850, I was in correspond-

ence with Andrews, [see appendix A.] furnishing him with returns of trade, tonnage, canals, &c., which I had collected from original Canadian and American sources—our own trade returns not having as yet been systematically commenced, and the few statistics published not being wholly reliable.

In January, 1850, a Reciprocity Bill was reported to the House of Representatives, from the Committee on Commerce at Washington, and recommitted in March, with a view to provide in it for the free navigation of the St. Lawrence. In May the Committee reported on this question, and the President sent a Message to Congress about it; but slavery agitation, and the death of President Taylor, in July, 1850, prevented further action in that year.

I had re-entered the Government service at the request of Mr. Merritt, in 1850, and during the summer was engaged in an examination of the Rapids of the St. Lawrence—to the possible improvement of which I had called the attention of the Government a few years before, while engaged in similar works on the Ottawa—and also of the harbours below Quebec; as well as the exploration of Intercolonial Canal and Railway routes, between Canada and New Brunswick, *via* Lake Temiscouata. On my return from New Brunswick, in Nov., Mr. Andrews, in consequence of the success of my canal and railway essays, applied for my assistance, and I received the following, from the Chief Commissioner of Public Works:

TORONTO, November 19, 1850.

DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 24th, giving the results of the Temiscouata exploration, is at hand. I am sorry to find it proves so formidable an undertaking. My present object in writing you is to state that Mr. Andrews, the American Consul, wants you to assist him with certain information, which I have assented to, after you have completed the St. Lawrence plans and estimates. After this, I have no objection to you rendering any assistance to Mr. Andrews. During the time

you are absent—as he wants you to accompany him to Boston—your assistant can complete his towing-path work.

Yours, &c.,

T. C. KEEFER, Esq., Montreal. W. H. MERRITT.

I went to Boston and assisted in the preparation of the Canadian section of Andrews' first report—returning before Christmas; and, until the publication of this report, in February, 1851, I was preparing information for it, and replying to demands, making explanations, &c. [See appendix A.]

In July, 1851, Andrews was again appointed special agent by Corwin, Secretary of the Treasury, to visit the British North American Colonies, and "collect full and complete statements of their trade and commerce with the United States, and with other parts of the world, inland and by sea, for 1850 and 1851, with such information as could be procured of the trade of the Great Lakes." The first report was made under the order of the President: this was called for under a resolution of the Senate. Whether it was ordered for the benefit of the printers—the source of many public documents—or to stave off a disagreeable question, on the plea of "further information required," it is impossible to say: the latter expedient has been frequently resorted to in other places besides Washington.

I had resigned my Government employment in 1851, after Mr. Merritt withdrew, in order to commence the surveys for the Grand Trunk Railway, and went to England in September. On my return in November, Mr. Andrews again solicited my assistance for his second report, which was intended to be far more extensive and complete than his first one. I declined to assume the responsibility, or go to the labor of preparing a complete statement of the trade of Canada, if based on official returns, the first volume of which had been published without shewing the true international, local, or transit trade. I had taken the trouble, *pro bono publico*, to address the proper department, more than six months before, with some suggestions on this head—[see appendix C.]—which received a cold acknowledgment, but no farther consideration. I, how-

ever, drew up a circular to customs officers, which instructed them to fill up "the enclosed blanks," and send them to the Astor House, New York, addressed to Andrews, by the 30th January, 1852; and agreed if that circular were signed by Mr. Hincks, I would undertake the task. This was done, and I thereupon prepared blank forms, which with the circular were printed and enclosed in envelopes from the Inspector General's Office. All the collectors responded promptly, and in February I went to New York and remained there until April, working at the report, but did not complete it until after my return.

Andrews refers to the manner in which his statistics was procured when he says, in page 12 of his Report:—"The returns have been carefully compiled not only from official documents, but from trustworthy private sources. and in this connection, the undersigned gratefully expresses his obligation to THOS C. KEEFER, Esq., of Montreal, for his contributions respecting the resources, trade and commerce of Canada;" and on page 405, he acknowledges the large map of the Valley of the St. Lawrence which I prepared for his Report.

In this report I took the opportunity, on pages 426, 427, and elsewhere, to draw attention to the same deficiencies in our Canadian statistics which I had the year before so unsuccessfully brought under the notice of our Government—confident that this course would now prove effectual. The volume of our trade returns for 1853, which was published next after the appearance of Andrews' report, accordingly contains half a dozen new tables, bearing on the deficiencies, while the two volumes which followed next after my letter of 1851 took no notice of them; indeed, in 1852 there is one table less than for the preceding year. The proposed emendations were not without honor, save in our own country.

A member of the Executive wished to read the report before it was sent to Andrews, and returned it with the following note:—

MONTREAL, April 14, 1852.

DEAR KEEFER,—

I return you the report, which I think excellent. Of course you will keep a copy; this is requisite, for I would not be surprised if something happens to prevent its publication. I have no great faith in Reciprocity being carried.

The want of faith expressed in the postscript is explained in the following extract from a note received a week afterwards, from another member of the Executive in Quebec :—

"As for Reciprocity, I will endeavour to carry out your suggestions. * * * * If the American Goverment chose to interest itself the thing could be done."

Our Executive saw that the American Government took no interest in the question, and hence despaired of success.

No progress had been made in 1851; and in 1852—although the Chamber of Commerce of New York had asked Congress to obtain Reciprocity, the fisheries, and the free navigation of the St. Lawrence, and the Committee of Commerce at Washington had presented a report on colonial trade—further action was arrested by "a spec of war."

Mr. Hincks, in 1851, had gone to Washington in the hope of getting passed the original measure,—that referring to Canada alone—but failed; irritated thereby, he suggested coercive measures—closing of the canals to American vessels, and a prohibitory duty on American manufactures; and joined the railway delegates from the Lower Colonies, assembled in Toronto in June of that year, in taking steps to protect the fisheries—from whence dates the foundation of the Canadian Navy. The only notice these movements attracted at Washington, was that Webster told Sir Henry Bulwer these "petty annoyances on the part of the Colonies must cease" before he would resume negotiations, and Sir Henry immediately telegraphed Lord Elgin. In Canada they were considered to be as powerless as they were insincere. Mr. Merritt had therefore proposed that Great Britain should be asked to levy the same duties against the United States as the latter levied against Canada.

The Whig ministry in England had turned a deaf ear

to the complaints by the Lower Colonies of the encroachments of American fishermen; but on their fall, in 1852, Sir John Packington, who had just demolished Mr. Hincks' railway scheme, unexpectedly came to his aid in the Reciprocity matter, by taking up the cause of the Lower Colonies, and a British fleet appeared on the fishing grounds in 1852. So far was this from expediting negociations, that the United States Senate treated the movement as a threat, and refused to legislate under duress, while in the House the chairman of the Committee on Commerce refused to report a bill nearly matured. Even Webster, the Secretary of State, who was known to be favorable to a treaty, declared the fishermen should be protected, "hook and line, bob and sinker:" and an American steam frigate was forthwith despatched to do this. Notwithstanding these demonstrations, the British Admiral, Seymour, and the American Commodore, Perry, exchanged compliments instead of cannon balls, and it turned out that the former had been instructed not to enforce the British construction of the fishery convention of 1818, but to let matters go on as they had been for the past seven years. Things being thus made pleasant, the authorities at Washington consented to resume negotiations, and in December, 1852, and February, 1853, President Fillmore sent messages recommending a convention to embrace Reciprocity, the fisheries, &c.; but Everett, who became Secretary of State on the death of Webster, only proposed that Congress should admit Provincial fish duty free on condition that United States fishermen were admitted to full participation in the Provincial fisheries. This was done in order to throw the onus of any trouble arising out of the fishery question upon Great Britain, and to evade Reciprocity with Canada altogether.

In March, 1853, Pierce became President, with Marcy as Secretary of State, and Buchanan as Minister to England. The latter proposed to transfer the whole question to England, and offered to take Andrews with him as an attaché. This he opposed successfully, and was sent to the President, by whom he was requested to put his views in writing, which he

did with much ability and effect in May, 1853. In July, he was again sent for, and in August accompanied the Secretary and the British Minister to Berkley Springs, where a *projet* for a treaty was arranged, and the first real progress made.

Before leaving Washington with these instructions, he was sent for by the President, who expressed much interest in his mission, and desired to be kept advised of his progress. Andrews took advantage of the interview to express his own sentiments—"that no attempt should be made to drive a bargain with the Colonies, but that they should be treated in the most liberal and considerate manner"—and said if these were not the President's views, he would rather not accept the charge entrusted to him. The President assured him of his approval—and the following extracts from his instructions, not only shew the important part played by Andrews, but the extent to which his views had at length been adopted by the Cabinet.

"The duty is an important and delicate one, and requires the exercise of discretion, vigilance, and constant application. On this subject I have had full and frequent conversations with you, and have possessed you with the views of the Government on this interesting and important subject.

"You are acquainted with the history of the negotiations between this Government and Great Britain and the Colonies, and will not fail to explain in a proper manner to the leading colonists the causes which have retarded its progress. You are also intimately acquainted with its situation at the present time, and the advance, I hope, it has made since committed to my charge.

"You are aware that a projét of a treaty has been quite recently prepared by me, and submitted to the British Government with a brief dispatch, which is, as you know, the first offer ever made in this form on this question, and, whether accepted or not, will undoubtedly form the basis of a permanent treaty.

"Your position as an officer of this Government, residing for several years in the Colonies, and your acquaintance with the principal colonial officers, and your acquaintance with colonial trade, and that you have on several occasions been employed on important and confidential services by this and the Treasury Department on various matters relating to colonial interests, will, it is believed, aid you in carrying out the views of the Department, and enable you to report on those matters in which the Government feels a lively interest.

"The Government is aware that the Colonies are not agreed nor united on the question of reciprocal trade and the fisheries, and that a treaty which would be satisfactory to Canada might not be acceptable to the lower Colonies, particularly New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

"The Government is not unmindful of the necessity of having this treaty acceptable as far as possible to all the Colonies, being desirous that this, the first treaty made with Great Britain with entire reference to the Colonies, should have the effect of settling the various conflicting questions now at issue between the Colonies and this country, and not only increasing the commercial intercourse, mutually advantageous, *but to stimulate and extend an increased regard and interest for this country and its institutions.*

"Although *the feelings and sympathies of a people sometimes follow in the same channel with its trade and commerce,* and while *it would be gratifying to see such a result in this instance,* you are fully aware of the circumstances attending the early settlement of the Colonies, their past relations with Great Britain, and the exertions of that power to influence the public feeling there with a view of always having a permanent control over the local concerns and political opinions of the colonists.

"You will therefore in a proper manner confer with the most influential men in the Colonies to express the interest this Government has in their advancement, and its wish to increase and tighten the bonds which unite the two countries."

Although a treaty was agreed upon in August, 1853, it was not secured until June, 1854,—the assent of every Colony and of Congress being first necessary. There was a strong feeling against it in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; and Congress was doubtful. Andrews was as active and efficient in the lower Colonies, where he was well known, as in Congress—the legislative navigation of which he thoroughly understood. His continued activity, in connection with the Treaty, and the good service rendered by him, are evidenced by the following :—

GOVERNMENT EMIGRATION OFFICE,
ST. JOHNS, May 4, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR,

I have been at Boston to meet Andrews; thence we went to Halifax by mail steamer, and now we are here, having come across Nova Scotia *viâ* Windsor. Matters are beginning to look like a treaty—things are coming to a head at last. In order to discuss the terms of the proposed treaty with the United States, a meeting of delegates from each Colony is to assemble at New York the last week in this month. Lord Elgin will then have arrived, and will probably attend—very likely Mr. Crampton also. Andrews has done good service in getting delegates appointed, and smoothing many difficulties, both here and in Nova Scotia. In these two Colonies the objections principally exist.

M. H. PERLEY.

T. C. KEEFER, Esq., Montreal.

In consequence of numerous difficulties and delays, the bill giving effect to the Treaty could not be brought up for its

final passage until about two hours before the adjournment of Congress; and a ten minutes' speech, or the opposition of a single member, would have killed it. It could not have borne discussion, for the chief inducement to the union was the fisheries, which many claimed as already theirs by treaty and usage. The Eastern States and New York might benefit by the fisheries and the trade with the Colonies; the West was passive, on account of the free navigation of the St. Lawrence; but Pennsylvania was hostile to the admission of Nova Scotia coal; and the Southern and Middle States claimed that sugar and tobacco—*their* agricultural products—should go into the Colonies free. But so admirably had Andrews made his arrangements, by anticipating, satisfying, or deporting opposition, that the measure passed in silence,—for even a word of advocacy would have destroyed it: and if then arrested, it could not have borne a year's consideration by the varying interests in the United States. It passed simply because the country was not prepared, on that last day of Congress, for such a possibility.

After its passage, thousands of dollars—collected as duties in 1854—were refunded to Canadian shippers. Lord Elgin closed his administration in triumph. His Premier, who had denounced reciprocity when first proposed by Mr. Merritt seven years before, did not disown the credit which he obtained—like a vowel in prosody—by virtue of his position. The Governor General and the Colonial Delegates, the British Minister and the American Secretary, formed a tableau of political glory as brilliant and as deceptive as the variegated "fizzle" which ends a theatrical performance—made their bow to an admiring audience and dissolved the long standing partnership, leaving Andrews to wind-up the business —and pay the debts!

With respect to the expenses incurred by Andrews in connection with his reports—it may be observed that under his instructions of 1849, he was to be allowed his "travelling and other expenses during his absence"; and under those of 1851, he was told that "the payment of all expenses for travelling,

clerkhire, or contingencies of any nature, which may be incurred, will depend on an appropriation therefor by Congress or by the Senate from its contingent fund." Under this last his debts were contracted; and his misfortune was, that he had to present his accounts to officers and political parties different from those by whom he was authorized to contract them. The effect of such instructions was to encourage both recklessness and extravagance. To make a public officer personally liable for large disbursements until (perhaps his political opponents in) Congress reimbursed him, was to drive him to raise the necessary funds at high rates, and to extend and increase his indebtedness under the conviction that the more persons and the larger amounts he owed under such instructions, the stronger influence he would bring on Congress to secure payment.

The character of the expenses, so far as known to me, was as follows: The different branches of his report were placed in the hands of the most competent persons he could get to undertake it—who were brought together at one of the principal hotels, where parlors were taken for months. During this time, leading politicians, merchants and manufacturers, in passing through the city were invited to dine with Andrews and his coadjutors—on which occasion Reciprocity was made the subject of conversation, and advocated—information being given and objections to any point answered by some one of the party. Besides this, articles were prepared and their insertion procured in the leading magazines and newspapers—in all of which Reciprocity was advocated, either directly or indirectly. The *North American Review* in Boston—Hunt's *Merchant's Magazine* in New York, and De Bow's *Review* in New Orleans were thus enlisted. Some opposition and many prejudices arising from ignorance of the commercial system of the colonies were met and removed—and the quasi delegates really performed at these dinner tables a service as important as by their contributions to the report. Most men appreciate a good dinner, and Andrews purposely acquired a reputation for his. Thus men who could not be reached at other hours—but who must dine somewhere

—gave him his opportunity—for valuable and agreeable consideration.

Where opposition to the Treaty was strongest, as at Buffalo, much perseverance and discretion were used by Andrews to remove it, by visiting the places and people in person, and he was in every case successful. Reciprocity, which it was supposed could be brought about in six months, required more than six years, and while it lingered, the expenses ran up for want of means to put a stop to them, and by interest, discounts, &c.; and above all by continued expenses required to keep the project popular before the varying interests in the Union. The latter office was not in the power of either of the contracting parties. The Government at Washington had not the control of Congress, or of the Press of the United States; nor did they at any time desire them for the support of this measure. It required just such an enthusiast as Andrews—with his power of approaching everybody, of appeasing everybody, and offending no one—to take the special oversight of a measure which he prided himself on having converted from a Canadian to an Imperial question; with which he had so prominently identified himself; which he viewed and still views—with pardonable egotism but with much justice—as his own. The fact that through all the changes of Departmental heads and political parties, from 1843 to 1857, he remained nearly fifteen years in the service of the Government, proves him to have been no ordinary man. He has been censured by those he has been unable to pay: but Clayton, Secretary of State, in 1849, gave the President's endorsation to his "integrity, ability and prudence." Webster pronounced him "intelligent, active, and well informed," and just before his death, wrote him an official letter, acknowledging the receipt of his despatches and concluding with the following words: "The zeal, industry and ability displayed by you in the discharge of your consular duties, and other important trusts confided to you by this Deparment, merit and receive its highest commendation."

The best evidence of his patriotism in advocating Recipro-

city—as well of his contempt for money—is to be found in the fact that when his great services were acknowledged by his being appointed Consul General for British North America, he could, in addition to his salary of $4000 a-year, have pocketed $2 on every invoice entered under the treaty from Canada; and this tax, levied from the commencement instead of a 20 per cent. duty, would not have been noticed or objected to. But so partial was he to the freest intercourse that he would not even appoint consular agents, or require certificates of origin, or any other restrictions, until compelled to do so in 1857; and then he did not authorize them to levy fees. His successor, as is well known, took a different course, making thousands by it—until the outcry throughout Canada obtained a reduction from $2 to 50c. per invoice. Andrews had it in his power to have made Canada pay every dollar of the debts he assumed on account of Reciprocity, and the great mistake of his life was that he did not exercise it. In his appointment of consular agents also, he selected British subjects, in most cases, being unwilling to place us in the category of foreign countries. The moneys first contributed by Canada to promote the treaty were supplied under the approval of the British Minister. The interest which Andrews had in these contributions, was that which any man in his position would take in having efficient allies to aid him in carrying through the measure to which he was so fully committed. When, however, he failed, after years of effort, to obtain his claims from his own Government, and Canada, (again on the recommendation of the British Minister) performed an act of tardy justice in contributing to relieve him of his debts—it is quite possible that the whole of this was not devoted to others, but that, ruined as he was, he may have appropriated a portion to his own pressing necessities; which would only be partially recompensing himself for advances long before made.

If, at the time the treaty was passed, he could have appealed to Canada to pay the obligations he had assumed, the money would have been raised by a general subscription of the people he had so much benefitted; but his position precluded this

course, as his well known sensitiveness, on any allusion to the Canadian contributions, proves. This sensitiveness has been urged against him as indicating that his claims were not *bona fide:* but a little reflection will give sufficient grounds for it. It was his ambition that the Government of his country should acknowledge his services by paying his accounts, large as they were, and that every shilling advanced by Canada should be refunded. He overrated his power, no doubt, to get Congress to vote him his outlay. But it is quite clear that while pressing his claims before Congress, or the Department at Washington, any discussion of them here would have been most detrimental. Moreover, the fact that he had received moneys, however legitimately, from us, would ruin him in the estimation of his countrymen, as they would immediately connect the treaty with "British gold." Lastly, such a discussion might bring down his creditors without at the same time providing for them all. Some persons will not believe that the reported sums have been expended at all; others do not believe they could have been legitimately expended; while all must unite in saying that if ten times the amount could have procured the treaty, the investment would have been a good one. I am not aware that any money has been paid for any corrupt purpose, and from my knowledge of the matter I can readily believe that the whole of the outlay may have been incurred for legitimate objects. That many expenses were higher than necessary is quite possible—but by no means certain. Since the Treaty has been obtained, some will think a considerable portion might have been saved: but had it been lost to save a few thousand dollars, all would have condemned the managers.

The expenses of his numerous journeys from Washington to New Foundland, Canada, and the North-West; the employment of editors and correspondents to advocate his views for so many years; the expensive maps procured and published by him to accompany his reports—of the last of which Congress printed twenty thousand copies—together with the considerable sums promised to those who assisted him in his

report—make up a formidable bill: but by no means shew his obligations. He was assured from the highest quarters that the Treaty passed, all would be cheerfully paid; and to secure its passage and the connection of his name with it, he did everything and promised everything, which the principals should have done but could not do; and when it was passed he was thrown aside, and belittled, in order to magnify the great men who had so little to do with the reality of the success. ***Sic vos non vobis***, &c.

Andrews,—in his letter of 1862, to the Committee on Commerce,—shews (page 52) that he did not, and could not have done the work alone, and says:—"My thanks are due—and I am happy in having again another opportunity of being just—to Henry V. Poor (editor of the ***R. R. Journal***), whose high qualities are too well known to mention here; to Thomas C. Keefer, Esq., the accomplished and public-spirited Canadian Engineer; to M. H. Perley, Esq, one of the most intelligent public men in New Brunswick; to John L. Hayes, the able chief clerk of the Patent Office; to that great Colonist, the Hon. Joseph Howe, Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia, and to Mr. N. Davidson, of the Treasury Department, so well conversant with the internal trade and resources of the country." He has stated that he has paid one of the above nearly $12,000 during the five years of his treaty labors; and from this one fact, and the long years during which the question was left open, the magnitude of the outlay may be estimated.

With reference to my account, the extracts from some of Andrew's letters to me, will give an indication of the character of the services rendered—exclusive of those at Boston and New York, in 1850 and 1852. In printing them, as a necessary part of my own case, I have also given some passages to shew Andrew's views and feelings at different periods—his confidence in ultimate success, and his patience under sufferings and aspersion. Possibly his necessities have driven him to do, or omit to do what may have estranged friends and perhaps made enemies; but this is but the history of every case of

embarassment. No one would be more surprised than himself to find these extracts in print. If in taking this liberty with his correspondence, I have succeeded in establishing a better opinion of him among those for whom alone this publication is intended, I shall have done for him only what under the circumstances, I believe I would be expected to do; and it is due to him to state that I have not been in communication with him for nearly a year, do not even know his present address—and that he has never been advised of the step I have taken, or of any intention to allude to him in any way.

As to the amounts—the small sums received previous to 1857, were on account of disbursements made by me. For my own services I rendered no account. I uniformly assured him that I would not accept anything, unless it were paid by one of the Governments interested. When I saw the great expenses he was assuming for an object so important to us, I determined I would not increase his difficulties by personal demands. I knew that others, in the same relation to him as myself, received thousands, and doubtless I could also have obtained in 1852, his acknowledgments for double the sum which he proffered in 1857. The same time and attention bestowed on less important matters in my own profession, have earned me more than double the sum which he tendered me. The magnitude of his indebtedness to others stood in the way of his offering more, while both his inability to pay what he did offer, and my determination to leave the question of amount wholly to him, were reasons why I have taken no exception to the sum. In Sept. 1857, I received—in the form of paper which was not paid until 1861—25 per cent of the amount proffered by Andrews, after he had obtained nearly fifty times as much from our legislature. Believing that all which he received, and more, was required to relieve him of treaty debts elsewhere, I was willing to wait until the balance retained here was forthcoming—or until he succeeded at Washington. I felt that under the circumstances of my introduction to him—and the knowledge had by members of the Government of the services I was rendering, I could afford to

allow him to give the preference to those who were either more needy or more importunate.

Four persons were assembled at the Astor House, in Jan. 1862, preparing the Reciprocity Report. One, Mr. Andrews, was, after the passing of the treaty, made Consul-General for B. N. A., on account of his services, at a salary of $4000 a year, and perquisites of much greater value had he availed himself of them; another, the late Mr. Perley, was also, in recognition of his reciprocity services, made H. B. M. Commissioner for the Fisheries, at £1000 stg. a year for himself, and £500 stg. for his secretary; a third, Mr. Davidson, was provided for in the Treasury Department at Washington; the last two were also well paid for their services by Andrews. The fourth returned to Canada, asked for nothing and got it! He has waited for more than ten years that Andrews might have an opportunity of paying for his work, and thus making it his own. In bringing forward his claim,—necessarily accompanied with much egotism,—now, when the subject is probably for the last time to be presented to the Legislature, he would only say that he believes the course he has taken in relation to this matter will be approved, and that his just dues will not be prejudiced by his forbearance.

THOS. C. KEEFER.

Toronto, May, 1863.

APPENDIX.

A.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS OF I. D. ANDREWS TO THOS. C. KEEFER, FROM 1849 TO 1862.

[PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL.]

MONTREAL, October 19, 1849.

I have your favor of the 16th, and thank you for your kind attention. I have also to thank you for a copy of the Bytown *Gazette*, of 13th inst., and hope to receive the additional numbers containing (I suppose) the remainder of your report.

MONTREAL, October 26, 1849.

Please forward me a newspaper containing the second part of your valuable report, to St. John's, N. B.

ST. JOHNS, November 26, 1849.

I thank you for the running account of the lake trade, which you sent me at Montreal, it has been of great service. You had better gather all you can about the increased trade of the Lower Colonies with Canada, it will certainly be of great account.

ST. JOHNS, December 20, 1849.

Can you send me a statement of the Canadian Commercial Marine; I want it very much, and hope it contains the Lake Tonnage. Anything else about Canada will be valuable.

ST. JOHNS, February 4, 1850.

I am favored with yours of the 23rd ult., and the Marine statement. I am anxious to get a correct statement in detail of the traffic on the Canadian canals for 1848 and 1849; or, if both years cannot be obtained, either year will answer. Also the amount of revenue,—and, if the details cannot be given, an abstract and comparative statement for both years will answer. Did you get more revenue from Welland Canal in '49 than in '48? How much? Have you any correct statements of the exports from Canada to the United States *viâ* Lake Champlain in '49, lumber, &c., &c.? if so send with others.

WASHINGTON, March 30, 1850.

I am greatly indebted by your kindness and attention, and have to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of 21st inst., with valuable enclosure. Please enlighten me about the British Lake Tonnage.

[In November and December I was with Andrews at the Tremont House, Boston, at work upon his *first* report made by order of the President.]

WASHINGTON, December 19, 1850.

Ask about Board of Trade movements.

WASHINGTON, December 23, 1850.

I was favored with your's from Burlington, and thank you for your kind attention.

WASHINGTON, January 6, 1851.

You call my attention to the imports by sea. You will remember I spoke to you about it, and asked if Quebec and Montreal imports included those for Kingston, Toronto, &c.: please give me the facts about this matter. I got some good statements from *****, and will thank you to forward to me those you have gathered. I don't wish to flatter, but I have great confidence in your statements, and would like them exceedingly. If you can't attend to it, get one of your clerks to arrange them after hours, and I will pay him cheerfully. See the Secretary of the Board of Trade and Collector of Customs about my returns. Send me all the light you can and as soon as you can.

WASHINGTON, January 9, 1851.

I got yours with enclosures, and thank you. The Reciprocity Bill is made the special order for Tuesday fortnight, in the Senate, and first Tuesday in February, in the House. If we can't do better is it best to take the bill without lumber? Send me all you can, and what you can. I am quite sure that there will be more discussion about the Reciprocity this year than ever before, and none can say what the result will be. * * Write me all about your views.

WASHINGTON, January 11, 1851.

In looking over my returns I came across the enclosed, which are comparatively useless because imperfect. I find I have not the data to perfect them. I send them to you with the hope you will oblige me. If you can send them by return mail, it will be a blessing to millions yet unborn. Send me all you can and as fast as you can.

WASHINGTON, January 15, 1851

Give me all the light you can till I get over.

WASHINGTON, January 24, 1851.

On the Reciprocity question I took high ground generally in my report, but ***** was not up to it; wanted me to alter it, which I refused to do. I must send you some money, and will do so; the fact is ***** is so much engaged I can't get his ear, nor his cash.

WASHINGTON, February 5, 1851.

My report is now before the Secretary of the Treasury, and will go to Congress to-day or to-morrow; there will be a strong effort made for Reciprocity.

WASHINGTON, February 17, 1851.

Things look bad to-day, nothing will be done. Neither the Tariff nor Reciprocity will go.

WASHINGTON, March 1, 1851.

Reciprocity is "cold" for this session; in fact nothing will be done but pass appropriations. I send you proof copy first of report.

WASHINGTON, March 15, 1851.

I shall pay you and *****; so have faith: want of faith is peculiar to colonists. There is no other live colonist besides you who can cut up and get statements of trade, &c., &c., out of nothing.

[Andrews being instructed to procure fuller and more recent statistics, under an order of the Senate, again visited Canada, and, at my suggestion, obtained the authority of Mr. Hincks to the collectors to send special returns direct to himself at New York.]

QUEBEC, December 23, 1851.

I got enclosed from Mr. Hincks; make out a memorandum or form for the blank forms, and get them printed with the circular; it would be well to have the circular on a separate sheet. ***** is making out for me a list of ports.

BUFFALO, January 18, 1852.

Find out the quantity of fish received from the Lower Colonies at Quebec and Montreal, and the quantity sent up the river above. Find out how much coal Canada imported from the United States. How much corn does Canada take from the United States?

NEW YORK, January 23, 1852.

Several of the collectors have responded, hope the others will do as well. I send all to you, for I have not time to examine them; keep the letters and envelopes, the latter on account of the postage, the former to acknowledge. I believe the Canadian Western Railway has made annual reports for several years—some of them valuable—please look them up, and notice that road as it deserves. Do you know any one in Plattsburgh and Burlington who will give you a good synopsis and summary statement of total trade on Lake Champlain?

BOSTON, January 26, 1852.

I sent you from New York the other day copy Railroad Journal, and lots of documents "on Her Majesty's service." I will thank you to be particular to notice about coal to Quebec and Montreal from Britain and the Colonies: also from the United States inland: also exact quantity of breadstuffs sent to the Lower Colonies and to Europe by the St. Lawrence.

BOSTON, January 26, 1852.

I have received from England a number of valuable returns. I have not time to examine as they should be. I send them to you that they may be carefully looked over, and the best possible use be made of them; Colonial first, Canada second.

[I was with Andrews at the Astor House, New York, the whole of February and March, working at the second report, which I completed after my return, and sent to him from Montreal.]

NEW YORK, April 3, 1852.

Send your report to my address, Washington. I think you had better let your assistant extend the following tables in my report to include 1851—Nos. 58, 57, 45, 44, 42, 41, 38. If you think proper to extend the tables, incorporate them in the text part of your report.

NEW YORK, April 6, 1852.

I got pretty good intelligence from Washington. You may send me the report to my address here as soon as you please; hope you will be able to Express it by Saturday, but take a day or two more if necessary.

NEW YORK, April 10, 1852.

I saw McLennan this morning; he says that map of yours shall be the handsomest lithography ever sent out from New York. Please let one of your people arrange this into superficial feet and send it to me—don't keep it long. If you have not the tonnage built in Canada last year, as well owned and registered, get it and send to me.

NEW YORK, April 20, 1852.

I got your report and agree with *****, and think it excellent. Have the returns all made out as you named in your letter. I will send you the "tin." Read the enclosed, and say what I should do with it. *Mind this, we shall get Reciprocity.*

NEW YORK, April 28 1852.

I advised you to go Washington: will you follow it? Please let your man make up a statement of Canadian Imports and Exports (distinguishing the countries) for 1840, 1845, 1850, and 1851.

NEW YORK, May 3, 1852.

The Lake Trade bothers me * * address me here on receipt of this. I shall send you some *tin* soon as I get to Washington, perhaps before, and will make it all right. I wrote you for some specific returns of Canada, say something after the manner of your blue books. Take my advice, send your brother to Lake Superior, and you go to Washington. I will make it right, and I have great hopes that I shall be able to make ****** ask Lord Elgin for you. You must help me manage, or advise me how to manage; my idea is something like this: ***** does not care much about Reciprocity on account of some of his local schemes—because he wants a little local glory—yet, if there is a chance of its going, he would like to have it said "*I did it.*" Again, ***, **** ****, **** ****, and **** are all more or less in favor of Reciprocity as a leading measure, particularly if **** don't succeed in England, and either of these would like "a good hunk of glory." Now I am nearly right I think, and more right in this—that you have done more for Canada, outside and inside, than the whole team; and I am in favor of your making all the capital you can, independent of everything else, and of every body. I am convinced that you can do more in a certain way in Washington, than all the rest. Turn this over in your mind and advise me how to act, and write me here on receipt of this. **** has been to Washington and returned; he says Reciprocity will not pass because it cannot be touched, but it will pass if fairly before congress.

[The last seven names in asterisks were then members of the Government of Canada.

The opinion of other competent observers as to the prospects of Reciprocity at this time, may be gathered from the following] :—

GOVERNMENT EMIGRATION OFFICE,
ST. JOHN'S, May 5, 1852.

MY DEAR SIR,—

I left our friend Andrews at the Astor, on the 13th April, and by telegraph yesterday I learned that he and Davidson are still there. He does not seem to be able to get the Lake Trade finished to his satisfaction, and you will probably have to go and put him straight, for it is a matter about which I know nothing. I presume Andrews keeps you "posted up" about Reciprocity, which just now, seems to be taking a new phase at Washington. It may come to a treaty after all; it is far more likely to be accomplished in that way than in any other.

Yours truly,
M. H. PERLEY.

T. C. KEEFER, ESQ., Montreal.

NEW YORK, May 24, 1852.

Draw on me at sight, National Hotel, Washington, for $100, and send me the bill and I will provide in some way more tin. I got your returns; how nicely you do things! In yours of May 1st you say "I have had to overhaul and correct many errors, which caused much delay. The results will not correspond with my report, as I have obtained fuller information since." Do I understand by this that I have to make any corrections? I made the necessary corrections noticed in yours of the 19th and 20th inst., but can not make them agree with your comparative statement of Canadian trade with all countries, on page 39. That is with the United States. I can not find No. 21, comparative statement of principal articles of import into Quebec in 1850 and 1851; also, No. 25, principal imports into Montreal, same periods.

WASHINGTON, July 5, 1852.

If you can send me the back numbers of returns do so. I shall do (I hope) well for you about money, soon as the report goes in. **** writes me you have the map; send it back by lightning speed, we are only waiting for it.

WASHINGTON, July 9, 1852.

I got a proof of the map, it is much liked, and I think you may well be proud of it.

NEW YORK, July 19, 1852.

Greatly disappointed that your proof is not here, what keeps it? For goodness sake hurry it on here, it is needed more than words can express.

NEW YORK, July 19, 1852.

I have just received from McLellan the North West part. The Bellisle part of the map, it is very bare,—don't look finished. Can it be *fixed?*

NEW YORK, September 16, 1852.

I hand you a cheque for $100, will send you more. Congress printed 13,000 copies of my report; this is considered very handsome.

NEW YORK, September 23, 1852.

I am looking on at *****'s work with interest. ***** is opposed to any retaliatory acts; but *mum*.

WASHINGTON, July 12, 1853.

So you are in England. The *tin* is expected, and when it comes you shall say what is right. I am glad to hear such good accounts of you, and hope it will always be so. You certainly deserve well of the Canadians, and of the world. I send by Express three setts of the maps.

NEW YORK, August, 1857.

I shall "fix" the money. In the original memorandum I put you down for one thousand pounds.

ALBANY, September 9, 1857.

I have waited day by day for $8000 from Washington. I wish to arrange, if not more than partially, your matter. I have given ***** an order on the Government, and send you his acceptance for $1000; use it, it is good paper.

NEW YORK, September 25, 1857.

I really did not intend to send you the draft but the money, not as Benedict took Beatrice, "out of pity." I expected to receive 6 to $8000 from Washington, it was on the point of being paid.

NEW YORK, October 24, 1857.

I shall say the office [Consular Agency at Toronto] was placed at your disposal for Reciprocity services; and God knows it was anything but an equivalent!

BOSTON, December 25, 1857.

In regard to *******, let that matter [the protested draft] rest for the present. He has acted badly, but that is common since the days of the golden calf.

NEW YORK, January, 1858.

Should have written before, but hoped daily to have overcome the opposition of ********, ****, and ********, and to have gone to see you, cap in hand. Like Brutus, I am a man of many griefs, therefore keep your bowels of generosity always full. I shall see you and arrange with you before your Assembly adjourns

BOSTON, March 23, 1858.

I may tell you what I wish to do. To go to Washington next week, arrange matters, get out of debt, and have a breathing spell.

BOSTON, April 12, 1858.

Soon as I get South will *fix* your matters.

BOSTON, May 7, 1858.

I hope you are increasing your worldly store. I shall, please God, do my duty to you.

BOSTON, May 20, 1858.

Soon as Congress adjourns I shall see you.

WASHINGTON, June 16, 1858.

Congress has favored me by passing a resolution to have my accounts settled. I am at work upon my accounts. Where is *******'s draft?

WASHINGTON, June 23, 1858.

I am engaged upon the interesting matter of settling my accounts. I shall take care of you to your entire satisfaction, before I finish. Before I get through with money matters of the treaty I intend to return the whole amount to Canada.

WASHINGTON, June 26, 1858.

I intend to do this as I have written, and you may say so to ****—to return every shilling of that money to Canada, and shall do it before I get through with my accounts here.

NEW YORK, January 20, 1859.

It is possible the treaty may come up this session, and I must be prepared—although I have no interest, yet there is no one else. Let me ask you if the Secretary of the Board of Registration has got out another volume since '51, '52. I notice he estimates the population of Lower Canada, 4 to the square mile, and 29 for Upper Canada. What is the bounding line of Upper Canada? The Hudson Bay Co. or the Pacific? Can a statement of the trade of Canada for '58, be got out soon without much trouble?

NEW YORK, February 20, 1862.

I am gratified to know you got the money; have asked ******* several times but could never get any satisfactory reply. I gave him an order and a regular official assignment for the fuil amount upon the State Department, which he now holds. Nor have I for a moment failed to acknowledge my obligations to you—your considerate and friendly bearing, and your great and invaluable service in arranging the treaty. But what could I do? Clayton, Webster, and Marcy died; ******* and ***** were politically hostile to me, as also to the treaty and no decent person could have foreseen or apprehended the ungrateful meanness of ****** and ******; besides, no one knows my responsibilities in the Lower Colonies. To ****** first and last, I think I must have paid near $12,000, which is only one case. I think I was short on the Report $10,000 on account of delay and additional expenses, and with this load in the unjust shape of a personal debt, I assumed the care and the management of the treaty. The Canadian money which Mr. Webster had assured me should be contributed, came in such a questionable shape, cost so much, and came so late, its influence was nearly destroyed.

I am surprised myself at what I did—what a great work I accomplished—and yet no Colonist has ever said "thank you." To you and H. V. Poor, I am under many obligations. What a heavy load I have for years borne! I have been *in jail several times*—have often, *often* wanted a dollar, since I saw you, and have not been able to visit my brothers for several years; have been abused, and my best motives impugned by those I have served best. I had no personal interest at stake, and yet, to either Government, the treaty was cheap at a million, if great results, peace, and great prosperity can be so measured. Let it all pass; let suffering in a good cause, and wrong doing, sleep in the same grave; let ****** flout his honors, and ****** pocket his money. Do not address me any more as "Late Consul General." I did not apply for that or any other office. My accounts still unsettled; not a cent yet.

NEW YORK, May 1, 1862.

I am writing a paper about the treaty; I do not know but it may be premature, but for me I see no other way. The treaty is attacked and no one to defend it, and when that is attacked so am I indirectly. I do not know how far or deep I shall go. I send you the three first forms, am promised two more which you may get by this mail. I am doing it solitary—solitary and alone. Pray look it over and tell me what you think, frankly, if you approve or disapprove.

WASHINGTON, June 4, 1862.

I send you under frank all I have done; I do not exactly know what to do with it; it is larger than I thought of or wished; yet, I am told by several who have good judgement: "Print everything bearing upon the treaty." What do you think? please correct this, as you please, and return it to me. Spaulding of Buffalo made a speech against the treaty, and stated that there is a discrimination upon your canals against American tonnage. I presume it is not so, but please give me the facts.

WASHINGTON, June 17, 1862.

I thank you for your suggestions and corrections, and hope to profit by them. I am doing it all *alone*—in a hurry, without a dollar, and otherwise under unfortunate circumstances. I send now all I have from the printer. On the whole tell me how I have done it, and what you think of it. I hope you will not go to England until I finish it.

WASHINGTON, June 20, 1862.

The Treaty gets knocked right and left, and no one to defend it but your humble servant. It is said you make discriminations against the Yankees on the Canals, how is that? If any thing recent is published, showing the quantity of your agricultural products for last census, please send it to me without fail, and if you are too much engaged please ask some one to do it. I need it *severely*.

B.

BOSTON, February 26, 1856.

SIR,—

The undersigned beg leave respectfully to represent that they were appointed a committee by the Boston Board of Trade, to take the necessary measures towards collecting funds for defraying certain expenses attending the negociations of the recent Treaty of Reciprocity with the North American Colonies.

They deem it proper to express their convictions, which are confirmed by the results already achieved, that this treaty is one of the most valuable to the commercial and industrial interests of the country, ever made by the Government. Several members of the committee are conversant with the history of the negociations, and the difficulties which had to be surmounted, before the treaty could be completed. They are cognizant of the years of service devoted to the subject by Mr. Israel D. Andrews, and they have to inform you that this city will contribute its quota towards relieving him temporarily from his present embarrassments, growing out of treaty demands, for which he was obliged to become personally

responsible, and which your letter to him of December 4th, 1854, informs us, were not liquidated by the Goverment.

Mr. Andrews has been taken to jail on one suit, and held on bail on several others, for these debts; and it is only justice to say, that he has been kept in Boston on compulsion, and thus prevented from assuming his official position in Canada, or giving any attention to his private matters.

After a careful investigation of his accounts, the committee are of opinion that they are just and proper; and we trust that Congress, by appropriation, will relieve him from the opprobrium of not fulfilling his pecuniary engagements, made to advance a measure so important to the country and so creditable to your administration.

A partial correspondence has already been opened with New York, Toronto, Oswego, Hamilton, and other places, in the hope that those cities, equally benefitted with Boston by the treaty, would gladly join in aiding this object.

We have given this subject all the attention in our power, and regret that Mr. Andrews has been compelled to remain here so long, but the very general belief that it was a legitimate claim, incumbent on the Government to settle, and the earnest desire expressed by him to avoid publicity, have extended the time longer than was anticipated.

Mr. Andrews presents no claim for personal services, to the committee. The contributions, so far, have been appropriated to actual expenses.

In conclusion, permit us, Sir, to congratulate you upon the beneficial results of the Treaty measures, which are so highly appreciated in New York, New England, and the Great West; and to hope that the reciprocal commercial policy you have thus inaugurated, may rapidly extend to our relations with all foreign countries.

We have the honor to be

Your obedient servants,

SAM. LAWRENCE.
GEO. B. BLAKE
ENOCH TRAIN
S. S. LEWIS

To His Excellency
The President of the United States.

C.

MONTREAL, March 20, 1851.

SIR,—

Having given some attention to the trade returns of this country, and having had occasion to compare them with those of the Lower Provinces and the neighbouring States, in which comparison, I am sorry to say, our official returns exhibit a poverty, looseness, and obscurity not to be found, I believe, in those of any other country professing to afford such information, I feel constrained to offer a few suggestions with no other object than to elicit investigation, and lead the way to an early reformation.

1st. The exports from Quebec and Montreal do not shew the true relative business of these ports. Large quantities of flour exported by Montreal traders

is "lightered" down to Quebec in barges, there taken on board and credited to the exports of that place. In the published statement of exports the quantity so cleared at Quebec, in Montreal vessels, should be shown and credited to Montreal. If, in addition, the receipts "down the river" at Quebec could be kept as at Montreal, then the consumption and *local* export at Quebec could be ascertained. The value of the timber export at Quebec should be separated from that of the agricultural in all comparative statements.

2nd. The regulations of 1850, allowing boats to pass to St. Johns without entry, no longer make the statements of that port an index of the trade to Lake Champlain. The various inland ports receiving and exporting *viâ* St. Johns should shew this trade, and a statement from them, made up in the head office, should be forwarded to the collector at St. Johns, or added to that collector's statement, by which means this trade could be ascertained as before.

3rd. Imports for inland ports *viâ* the St. Lawrence are not now credited to Montreal, but pass up under warrant without entry here. The exhibit of those inland ports should shew this trade distinct from imports *viâ* United States.

4th. As prices fluctuate, the quantities, (as well as the values of all articles) as far as practicable, should be given in imports and exports, under a reduction to a *common denomination* (not a mixture of bags and barrels, kegs and packages, tons, &c., as at present.)

5th. A strict classification, as detailed as possible, should be made and rigidly adhered to, without which comparative statements are scarcely published in two consecutive years in the same words or under the same heads.

6th. The *winter* imports should be shewn, particularly foreign and other articles brought in by railway to Toronto *viâ* Lewiston, Montreal, Prescott, Kingston, and Niagara Frontier, in order that we may see the class of articles which can bear this transport. The same exhibit of our exports, when the navigation is closed, is desirable.

7th. The registry of all inland craft should be *compulsory*, if for no other purpose than to ascertain our tonnage.

8th. A statement of imports *viâ* United States under drawback, and of exports by that route under debenture should be shewn; the imports specifying the country from whence imported; the exports showing the destination,—which could probably be procured from American authorities only.

I will now make a few remarks on the principal tables in the "Trade and Navigation" list published last year.

No. 1. The quantities only, or the values only, of important articles are given, while both quantities and *total* values of comparatively unimportant ones are given. More than half the total value of dutiable goods are unenumerated. Both No. 1 and 2 should be added up to compare with No. 8, and should have similar classification; both tables should be more detailed in important items.

No. 3. Should give the values of the different kinds of sugars, coffees, wines and liquors, tobacco, &c.

No. 5. Should *separate* the expenses of Montreal, St. Johns, Quebec, and Gaspé, and compare them with former years.

No. 7. The quantities should all have *one* denomination (thus pickled fish, is given in kegs, barrels, cwt., and casks) and the quantities to different countries be shown as well as the value; the quantities being the most important, considering that flour ranges so much in price. This table should be followed by one shewing the proportion exported by sea, by inland ports *viâ* St. Lawrence Canal, and by inland ports *viâ* New York Canals, with the amount bonded for export under debenture.

No. 8. Should be more detailed, shew *quantities* from different countries, and the routes, as above, by which imported; and drawback imports.

No. 9. (Quebec and Montreal for 1848 do not agree with statements for same year in appendix to Board of Registration and statistics report.) In these values sea and inland imports should be separated, and an additional table shewing values of "drawback" imports at those ports where these are made.

Tables No. 14 and 20 come under the consideration of tolls and transit returns and regulations which are in a still worse condition. I will merely say here that No. 14 should give the revenue and expenditure on each work, and that No. 20 is worthless; all the cordwood scowed from shanty to shanty along our canals is mixed up with our own lumber exports, and transit of foreign do., and staves. The up and down trade are jumbled together, as also the through and way trade. This table should shew the *through* trade, down and up, separate from all others, and the Canadian from the American.

But I consider that neither of these tables, unless a mere revenue statement, belongs to the customs returns; I hope to see the business on our canals shewn in the fullest manner, the movement of every article up and down, and the tolls paid by that article.

Considering that our collectors of customs and tolls have from four to six months of comparative inactivity, we ought to present the most complete and satisfactory statement of our trade, foreign and transit, which a system is capable of. We only require that system to be established by those in authority.

I have hastily alluded to those questions which I can now call to mind. I do not pretend that what I have suggested is the best, I rather wish to draw attention to the evil in the hope that *the best* way to correct it may turn up. I think one of the most intelligent of the subordinates from the larger custom houses should be called in to aid in the compilation and arrangement, perhaps from Quebec or Montreal, as having been under the imperial regulations so long, and as possessing a direct foreign trade to instruct the employé. The question of canal tolls and returns is quite different from that of our customs, and would require a separate letter. Our rates of toll require revision, and an enquiry into the best means of protecting the canal revenues from fraud by shippers, or laxness on the part of the collectors, would not be amiss.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

THOS. C. KEEFER.

******* &c., &c., Toronto.

To relieve myself of a charge of presumption, in having written the foregoing to a Department presided over by Mr. Hincks, I must risk one of vanity, by giving the unsolicited opinion of one of his colleagues,—a man who had devoted his life to these questions, and who, however mistaken he may have been in his judgment, has never been accused of flattery.

St. Catherines, 26th February, 1857.

My dear Sir,—

You will receive herewith my opinion on the subject of the commercial intercourse between Great Britain and the interior of this continent —with the remedy, which is the establishment of a better line of steamers to Quebec than to New York—nothing short will divert or regain the trade; *that* will, in my judgment, effectually.

As no man in Canada understands the statistics of the trade, or the geographical position of the country, better than yourself, I would be glad to see your opinion on that subject published, if you have the leisure.

Truly yours,

W. HAMILTON MERRITT.

Thos. C. Keefer, Esq., Montreal.